5136261355 P.04/12

> RECENTO CENTRAL FAX CENTER

> > JUN 1 7 2004

Case 7070

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of

Donn Nelton Rubingh et al.

Serial No. 09/646,984

Confirmation No. 3865

September 25, 2000

SUBSTITUTIONS

Group Art Unit 1652

Examiner W.W. Moore

SERINE PROTEASE VARIANTS HAVING AMINO ACID DELETIONS AND

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL OFFICE ACTION UNDER 37 CFR \$1.116

Mail Stop AF

Filed

For

Commissioner for Patents

P.o. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Examiner:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

In response to the March 17, 2004 Office Action in the above-entitled application, please amend the application as follows and consider the following remarks.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims, which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/Response to Office Action begin on page 6 of this paper.

07/02/2004 DHILLIA4 00000004 162480 Sale Ref: 00000004 DAW: 162480 096 09646984 09646984 01 FC:1202 54.00 DA



Appl No. 09/646,984 Atty. Docket No. 7070 Amdt. Dated June 17, 2004 Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2004 Customer No. 27752

water-sensitive dermatological active agents or cosmetic active agents as preferred embodiments for personal care compositions. See column 16, line 64 to column 17, line 5. Therefore, Powell et al. teach away from Applicants' claimed invention by teaching only non-aqueous compositions.

Furthermore. Powell et al. only teach the preparation of a personal care composition comprising subtilisin SP 544, while Bryan et al. specifically teach subtilisin deletion and modification. One skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine a reference teaching specific deletions and modifications of specific regions of different subtilisins with the Powell et al. general description of a personal care composition comprising subtilisin SP 544. Bryan et al. specifically teach altering amino acids in subtilisin BPN' to increase stability with metal chelators. Powell et al. teach that subtilisins can be used in personal care compositions, and there would be no motivation to combine that broad and general teaching with a reference teaching inhibition of proteolysis in an industrial environment.

Therefore, Applicants contend that a prima facle case of obviousness has not been established, and the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. WHEREFORE, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein and allowance of Claims 1, 2, 11, 14-16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, and 29-34.

Respectfully submitted, Donn Nelton Rubingh, et al.

Laura L. Frieko

Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 52,920

(513) 626-2721

June 17, 2004

Customer No. 27752